How Fulbright and Young Quizzed Laird, Pgs. 2-3

Lines Dedicated To Jan Palach

Now that Soviet man has learned to walk in space, maybe he'll learn next how to stand erect in Prague and Moscow. For us the truer pioneers are the Czech students who seek a peaceful road to a humane socialism. Space flight, once you get past Sir Isaac Newton, is a triumph of hardware. We prefer the struggle to let the human spirit soar.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVII, NO. 2 JANUARY 27, 1969 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

So What's A Little Isaiah Between Friends?

The Nixon inaugural must have set a record for the number of invocations. We counted four before Nixon took the oath and one afterward. Indeed it might be said there were six, for Nixon's own inaugural address was in the same genre, so much so that at one moment when our attention wandered we thought Billy Graham had been elected President. From Nixon's first reference to "the majesty of this moment" to that peroration in which he urged us to build a "cathedral of the spirit" we realized we were hearing a Golden Treasury of the pulpit's most venerable purple phrases. The Ministry lost what the country has gained.

Add The Gospel Gap

Isaiah is our favorite prophet. Ordinarily we would have been pleased when Nixon let it be known that he would take the oath of office on a Bible with its pages open to Isaiah. But we could not forget that Johnson—who could also sound like Billy Graham—started out by leaning heavily on Isaiah, too. His favorite quotation, particularly in his campaign against Goldwater, was Isaiah's "come, let us reason together" but it fell into disuse after he began bombing North Vietnam. Nixon chose that page of Isaiah in which the Prophet spoke of beating swords into ploughshares. This would be heartening if Nixon's speeches on the need for bigger arms spending during the campaign, and his choice for Secretary of Defense, did not seem to suggest that we might have to beat ploughshares into swords. Melvin Laird hasn't been spending his years on the House Appropriations defense subcommittee trying to sell the armed services on Isaiah. Laird has written about a Strategy Gap. Nixon has spoken about a Security Gap, a Submarine Gap and an armament Research Gap. Perhaps it would be safest to put this Isaiah incident down to a Rhetoric Gap, like the Gospel Gap which enables Billy Graham to denounce materialism—as he did at the Inaugural—while remaining a favorite spiritual back-scratcher of the pious rich.

We would be more impressed with the peaceful sentiments expressed in the Nixon inaugural if they had not become standard fare. Kennedy and Johnson, too, spoke evangelically in their Inaugurals of the terrible power of the new weaponry, the need for peace and for diversion of resources to human need. Then they added a "but" about remaining strong, and this—if strength can be measured in more arms—was serious. "Let us cooperate," Nixon said, "to reduce the burden of arms. . . . But to all those who would be tempted by weakness, let us leave no doubt that we will be as strong as we need to be. . . ." Kennedy, too, made the same pledge and then in almost the same words added, "We dare not tempt them with weakness." Kennedy proceeded to step up the arms race and Nixon is pledged to do the same. Nixon announces an era of negotiation as Johnson promised "we will be unceasing in the search for peace." In less than two months he was bombing North Vietnam. Henry Cabot Lodge was then his special adviser and soon to be Ambassador in Saigon as he will now be Nixon's at the Paris talks. Though the objective circumstances have changed, the parallels are not reassuring.

Our Presidents at their Inaugurals have all come to sound like card-carrying members of the Fellowship for Reconciliation. It's easier to make war when you talk peace. They make us the dupes of our hopes, as the newspaper headlines the morning after inaugural about Nixon's "sacred commitment" attest. Johnson, too, snowed the country with a similar performance when he went up on Capitol Hill for a last boast-in and sob-in among his old cronies, those aged pygmies in aspic, preserved from reality by the gelatinous mutual flatteries which fill the Congressional Record. They are all

(*Continued on Page Four*)

A Self-Satire of The Peace Movement

If the CIA had set out to produce a savage burlesque of the peace movement, it could not have done better than the counter-inaugural staged by the National Mobilization Committee—known familiarly and all too accurately as "Mob." There were the good people in it who turn up for every march, and there were devoted young people. The organizers, David Dellinger and Rennie Davis, are impressive in private. But the tone was set by kooks. There was no dignity and little discipline. In the circus tent—a most appropriate scene—for the rally before the march, there was one moving moment when an armless Vietnam veteran turned up from Walter Reed hospital to make a plea for peace which was all the more effective for being inarticulate. But this was soon wiped out when all men but the wounded were ordered off the platform to make way for the "Women's Liberation Army." Their speakers sounded as if they had been invented by Art Buchwald with an assist from Aristophanes. Their accusation that men were only calling for revolution to get power for themselves was met by obscene jeers from the male audience in an uproarious climax of self-satire. Nothing could have looked more out of place in the parade which followed than the huge portraits of Martin Luther King, A. J. Muste and Gandhi, all apostles of non-violence and love, carried along by what seemed to be more than a sprinkling of escaped lunatics filled with hate, expressing themselves in obscenity and itching to fight cops, as they did here and there despite the valiant efforts of the parade marshals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Laird's Replies, Though Careful, Indicate A Spiralling Arms Race Lies Ahead

How Fulbright Managed to Quiz Nixon's Appointee As Secretary of Defense

In an unusual move which may set a precedent for the future, Senator Fulbright as Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee sent a letter to Chairman Stennis of Armed Services asking the latter to put 11 questions to Melvin Laird. Fulbright's letter recognized that Armed Services has primary responsibility for nominations to Secretary of Defense but said his questions were justified because "many aspects of military and foreign policy have become so interrelated," and his were "questions which may not be raised by members of your committee." That was sure.

The Nuclear Superiority Will O'The Wisp

The first four questions and answers indicate that Laird still believes in trying to maintain nuclear superiority. Fulbright first asked whether Laird thought there was a point beyond which increases in weaponry merely increased the dangers of war. Laird replied that he believed in maintaining "a superior military position that is clear for all to see" and that this would *decrease* the danger of war. Past arms races provide proof to the contrary.

Fulbright then asked whether the U.S. could not achieve greater security through arms control arrangements such as a pact not to build an ABM. Laird replied that he hoped for such arrangements but thought they could be reached only if we dealt "from a position of superior nuclear strength." Question No. 3 asked whether Laird thought the Soviets would allow us to build stronger nuclear forces without striving to keep up. Laird replied that we should seek a superior position "with the understanding that the Soviet Union will in all likelihood continue to make strenuous efforts to improve its own strategic position." This means an endless race in armament accompanied by increased tension. When Fulbright asked whether the U.S. should "put more emphasis on arms control matters", Laird replied that the U.S. has already "placed maximum feasible emphasis" on arms control. Few advocates of arms control or arms reduction would agree.

Question 5 pointed out that the U.S. had spent about $3.5 billion in foreign exchange on military deployment abroad and asked whether Laird thought this could be reduced appreciably. Laird thought it should "wherever possible" but "without jeopardizing the security of the U.S. and its allies or *accepting any expansion* [our italics] either of the Russian or Chinese position or threat." This looks like a Pax Americana formula. Laird said NATO must be strengthened. "In Asia," he added, "a resolution in Vietnam which may not come as soon as we would hope but should be achieved in due course will certainly reduce expenditures there." This is not too hopeful.

Question 6 asked whether the U.S. military should help suppress revolutionary uprisings and whether it made any difference to Laird if the uprisings were led by Communists. Laird replied that it made no difference and that "the U.S. military should have no role in 'suppressing' genuine domestic revolutionary uprisings." But then Laird added that this did not exclude U.S. "military assistance if the uprising is aided from outside the country, the government in question requests our help and our national interests are directly and vitally involved." This is broad enough for intervention from Greece to Latin America.

In Question 7 Fulbright asked whether there was a need "to review our counter-insurgency doctrine and the policy underlying it" as a result of Vietnam. The Laird reply indicated that he thought the lessons should be used to improve counter-insurgency rather than scrap it.

A Slippery Reply on Military "Seminars"

Question 8 was easy, whether Laird favored strengthening the peace-keeping potential of the UN. He said he did. In Question 9 Fulbright asked whether Laird thought the Pentagon should carry out public indoctrination programs in foreign policy. Laird's reply was slippery.

"An unimpeded flow of unclassified information to the American public about defense matters is necessary," Laird wrote, answering a totally different question from that raised by Fulbright, "if the people are to understand the issues, to form their opinions, and to judge the defense policies of the Administration." But then he added, "I suppose this could be called 'education' to a degree. I do not believe it can correctly be called 'indoctrination'." This dodges the question of the military seminars which McNamara stopped in March 1961 after Fulbright exposed them as a way to let the military brain-wash the country.

In answer to the tenth question Laird said he was opposed to having the Pentagon sponsor social science research on non-military matters. Such projects have been the target of another Fulbright campaign. Finally Laird agreed with Fulbright that public concern about the military-industrial complex was justified. Judging from what the military-industrial journals are saying about Laird, he must have smiled when he wrote that.

Dietetic Note For The Nixon Era

Nixon's choice of Philip Campbell to be Undersecretary of Agriculture should give pause to everyone but vegetarians. As a representative of the meat industry-oriented National Assn. of State Depts. of Agriculture, Campbell vigorously opposed the 1967 Meat Inspection Act, which he will now be largely responsible for implementing. During the same hearings at which Campbell testified, it was brought out that state governments had been abysmally lax in maintaining clean meat standards within its jurisdictions—Pennsylvania, for example, had 1,530 nonfederally inspected meat facilities but only bothered to inspect 46 of these. Yet Campbell opposed the Federal Government's stepping in on the grounds that it would tend to discourage state initiative! Under the Mondale-Montoya compromise bill which was finally passed, the states have until December 1969 to meet federal inspection standards. With Campbell in office we'd better eat blintzes to be on the safe side.

Navy League Head Thinks America Can Rule The Waves With Laird In The Pentagon

"His [Laird's] selection to be the civilian defense leader is fortuitous, for out of the election of 1968 and beyond Vietnam, the U.S. must adopt a new grand strategy that will assure our supremacy for the century ahead . . . the new Secretary of Defense understands the true significance of strength. His constant reminder of the necessity for strategic initiative bears out this thesis."

—Chas. F. Duchein, president of the Navy League in the January issue of its organ, Navy. *Inserted by GOP Majority Leader Ford in the Congressional Record Jan. 14.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Strange Silence From Press and Congress As Goldwaterite Goes to The Pentagon

Sharp Questioning By Young of Ohio Shows Little Change in Laird's Views

If a Cabinet appointee had written a book only six years ago as far to the left as Melvin Laird's "Strategy Gap: A House Divided" (Regnery: 1962) is to the right, one may be sure there would be an uproar in Congress and the press. This was a Goldwater blueprint two years before the Goldwater campaign in 1964. Yet in a country which rejected Goldwaterism overwhelmingly as too dangerous just four short years ago, there is little protest when Nixon names a leading Goldwaterite of 1964 to be Secretary of Defense in 1968. The publications of the military-industrial complex are delighted with Laird's record and views. The liberals look the other way. The *New York Times* (Jan. 19) even published an editorial assessing the new Administration on the eve of its inaugural without even mentioning Laird!

Except for Fulbright, the only other Senator to raise question about Laird before his name reached the Senate floor was Stephen M. Young, the Ohio Democrat, the only maverick on the Senate Armed Services Committee. His time was limited and the atmosphere was not conducive to sharp examination, so Laird was able to be skilfully elusive.

Ike Too Soft For Laird

Young began by asking Laird about those passages in his book where he criticized Eisenhower for inaction in the East German rising of 1953 and in the Hungarian revolt of 1956, and criticized Kennedy for backing away at the Bay of Pigs. Young wanted to know what Laird would have suggested if he had been Secretary of Defense then. Laird replied that he did not think this would be "useful" because we had moved from an era of confrontation to one of negotiation, the favorite cliche of the Nixon administration. But what if accident or design bring us to new confrontations?

Laird's book advocated that we serve "credible notice" on the Soviet Union that we reserve the right to strike first "when the Soviet peril point rises beyond its tolerable limit", adding "the tolerable limit would not of course be too tightly defined." Young wanted to know whether the recent Czech invasion, Hungary in 1956, Berlin in 1961 or Cuba in 1962 would have been a such a point, justifying a first strike. Laird dodged the question by saying his view derived from a unanimous report by the House Defense appropriations subcommittee of April 1960 in which he had joined. This called for a pre-emptive strike "should it ever become obvious that an attack upon us or our allies is imminent." Since none of the cases Young cited, except that of Berlin, involved a Western ally, the answer was hardly responsive.

Young then read that passage in which Laird wrote—

On the day that the Soviet Union feels there is indeed a balance of power, nuclear war will become not only thinkable but in all likelihood inevitable, and that should the Soviet Union begin to approach real nuclear parity, we could not win a nuclear war but the Communists would.

The U.S. and the Soviet Union are now approaching parity in the number of ICBM's. Does Laird still think such a balance of power makes nuclear war likely, and does he still think the Communists—by some magic formula—can win a nuclear war when we cannot? Young did not follow up with these questions.

Laird provided a direct denial for the first time to Young's next question, which involved the view he expressed in the book that the Soviets would "use every trick and strategem to beguile us into sacrificing our time and efforts to hope of disarmament." Laird denied that this meant he would oppose the non-proliferation treaty or asume that we should make no further efforts to negotiate disarmament.

Young was allowed some more questions at the committee's second session Jan. 15. Laird said he was still dubious of the Soviet peaceful co-existence policy, and of the supposed rift between China and Russia though he thought we should exploit it. Young read passages in which Laird spoke of the moral obligation of the U.S. to take the initiative against Communism "in all areas while we have it." Young asked, "Now by this do you mean that you feel the U.S. has a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world?" Laird replied, "No I don't meant that."

Laird said his aim in Vietnam was self-determination by free elections. He was not asked about the rigged elections which brought the present Saigon government into being. Young asked what Laird meant when he wrote we should "give priority to the national security budget, and spend on non-defense only amounts which will not sacrifice the stability of the dollar." In reply Laird insisted that national security must have priority, claimed that in the House he had helped to boost the health, education and welfare budget "percentage-wise" even more than the Pentagon's and said "we cannot satisfy our military leaders at all times." Young asked about reports that Laird had doubts about a "thick" ABM system. Laird said he "wanted to look that over very carefully," before going ahead. Young's last question dealt with passages which inferentially criticized Fulbright for objecting to General Walker's methods in indoctrinating U.S. troops in West Germany. Young pointed out that Walker gave the troops John Birch material. Laird said "I would not support that."

Dangerous Fellow

Toward the close of the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing Jan. 15, Senator Strom Thurmond asked David Packard about an interview Nixon's choice for Deputy Secretary of Defense gave Chemical and Engineering News **last Nov. 25. In it Packard declared that while he was opposed to the sale of strategic goods, he thought "a larger volume of East-West trade" would "contribute to better understanding." Thurmond, a Reserve Major General and the Dixiecrat candidate for President in 1948, said he himself was "of the school" that opposed "trade with the enemy" of any kind. Thurmond wanted to be assured that "this particular question" would be left to the White House and that Packard did not intend to press his own views. Packard avoided giving such assurance. He said he "firmly" believed there should be no trade with the enemy "which would support his capability in a future confrontation." But then he added, "I think at the same time this world faces the proposition wherein there may be some changes in attitude that would favor a better accommodation, and I think the tremendous amounts of money that are being spent in the world today for armaments could, if it could be arranged without jeopardizing in any way the security of the country, [sic] I think the country would be better off if we had some of these funds applied to some of the very important social and other priorities of the citizens." Thurmond did not press Packard to expand his views on arms reduction. But we can easily imagine the Republican from South Carolina wondering where Nixon got that pinko with $300,000,000 who sounded like Cyrus Eaton.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Johnson Is Filling Every Military "Gap" Nixon Mentioned In the Campaign

(*Continued from Page One*)

g-r-e-a-t statesmen, like Lyndon and Sam and Gerry and what's-his-name. The surprise was not the last performance of Johnson-playing-Lionel-Barrymore-playing-Lyndon but the fact that he got away with it; the press by and large acted like sob-sisters in the 1890s covering a society ball to help the poor. Amid the sniffles no one was so uncouth as to peep into Johnson's fantastic exaggerations, like his claim to be spending $68 billion "for such things as health and education" the next fiscal year. More than $35 billion of this is normal expenditure from social security, where the government takes in more from the lower brackets than it pays out and the munificence is attested by Johnson's proposal to raise the minimum from $55 to $80 *a month,* just enough to keep a beneficiary from dying too visibly.

The Blacks Will Pay Twice

Johnson, too, talked of peace but it will be years before we stop paying all the costs—fiscal and social—of his Vietnam war. He said it was "imperative . . . to resist inflation". But it wasn't imperative enough for him to impose taxes on the profits his war inflation created in the upper brackets. The poor and the black will now pay with unemployment to fight that inflation, as they paid disproportionately with their lives to fight his war. He, too, talked of the need "to scale down the level of arms among the superpowers" so that "mankind" could "view the future without fear and great apprehension." But he may have set off a new spiral when he approved the "thin" anti-ballistic missile. And new arms for a fantastically overarmed nation take first priority in his final budget.

In the masterly flim-flam of budgetary accounting, the new estimates gloss over the fact that the war this year will cost $3 billion more than we were told before. A $3.4 billion decline is promised next year (largely due to the saving on planes and explosives if we continue to stop bombing the North). *But* the savings are already whisked away in a $4 billion increase in arms expenditures in the year beginning July 1. Total military spending will be $81.5 billion, nosing past the peak of World War II—how's that for Isaiah!

The poverty program remains just short of $2 billion but arms research and development will go up $850 million to a total of $5.6 billion, including work on such new goodies as missiles which can be hidden on the ocean floor. There's not a gap Nixon mentioned that the Johnson military budget does not fill—a "new generation" of missiles (how beautifully they breed!) with multiple warheads, five squadrons of new FBIII bombers (to keep Fort Worth and General Dynamics prosperous), $2.4 billion to give the Navy three fast new nuclear attack submarines, the quiet variety which won't disturb sleep in the ghettoes. There is more money for the Air Force's advanced bomber. Just to make sure we don't run out of new Vietnams there's three-quarters of a billion this year and a billion next for those overpriced C5A carrier planes which can get troops fast to any new trouble spot and millions more for three of those Fast Deployment Logistics ships which will take the place of foreign bases and have heavy equipment ready for the troops when the C5A's get them there. Even a submissive and somnolent Congress several years running has turned down the DPLs as an engraved invitation to more trouble but Johnson's budget asks Congress to come and reason together with him again about the item.

No wonder this is a smooth transition. It's practically one continuous performance, and better than ever for the Pentagon. So what's a little Isaiah between friends?

Here Lies Gene: Recquiescat Sed Non In Pace

On receiving the Eleanor Roosevelt peace prize recently from the National Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy, Senator McCarthy called for a vigorous examination by the Senate of Cabinet appointments especially for State and Defense. But on January 20 there was no word of protest from McCarthy when Teddy Kennedy as majority whip moved that the Senate confirm all Nixon's Cabinet appointees without debate except Hickel for Secretary of the Interior. Laird's appointment as Secretary of Defense is cheered by the military-industrial complex whose influence McCarthy deplored in the Saturday Review. Four years after Goldwater's defeat, the man who chaired the committee which wrote his platform has been confirmed without objection as Secretary of Defense. The Senate took only 21 minutes to rubber-stamp all Nixon's appointments but Hickel. The spectacle proves McCarthy was right when he said Teddy as whip would make little difference. But it also condemns McCarthy. How build an opposition around a man who doesn't give a damn, a dilettante in politics as in poetry?

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 1/27/69

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED